

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-22 remain pending. No new matter has been added.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of conducting a personal interview with Applicants' representative on February 4, 2009. In accordance with the Examiner's remarks at the interview, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that the surface treating head is "connected to the main body." Support for this amendment can be found, for instance, on pages 6 and 19 of the specification and FIGS. 1-7 of the drawings. As indicated by the specification and drawings, the term "connected" can refer to either direct or indirect connections between the main body and the surface treating head.

Applicants also thank the Examiner for the courtesy of holding a telephone conversation with Applicants' representative February 25, 2009 to further discuss claim 1. The telephone conversation focused on the configuration of the claimed support assembly, which comprises a "substantially continuous rolling support surface" that is "perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the main body" and is "symmetrical about the longitudinal axis of the main body." It was determined that Embree does not disclose such a rolling support surface because Embree's wheels 90 together do not constitute a "substantially continuous rolling support surface" due to their physical separation. It was also determined that one of Embree's wheels 90 by itself does not constitute a rolling support surface as claimed because neither of wheels 90 is symmetrical about a longitudinal axis of a main body. Rather, each of Embree's wheels 90 is located entirely on one side of a longitudinal axis of Embree's upright portion and therefore each wheel is not symmetrical about the longitudinal axis.

In view of these differences, claim 1 is allowable over Embree. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) based on Embree should be withdrawn.

Claim 2 further defines over Embree with the feature "the support surface extends for a distance which is at least 50% of the width of the main body." This limitation was discussed at

interview and it was determined that Embree fails to disclose such a support surface.

Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over Embree for this reason as well.

Several of claims 3-22 recite additional features related to the dimensions or shape of the claimed support assembly. Accordingly, like claim 2, these claims further define over Embree based on the recited dimensions or shape.

Finally, independent claims 2-22 all depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable over Embree at least based on their respective dependencies.

Early action allowing claims 1-22 is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing 424662010000.

Dated: March 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: B. Westover
Benjamin P. Westover
Registration No. 56,612

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
Telephone: (703) 760-7325
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777